

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed October 21, 2003, has been received and reviewed. Claims 61 through 71 are currently pending in the application. Claims 61 through 71 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 61 and 66, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

**Reissue Oath/Declaration**

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application has been objected to as being defective because it fails to contain a statement that all errors which are being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath/declaration arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the Applicants. A Supplemental Reissue Declaration will be filed upon indication of allowable subject matter.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. RE 38,049 to Dennison et al.**

Claims 61 through 71 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 66 of U.S. Patent No. RE 38,049 to Dennison et al. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence of the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached is the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections**

Claims 61 through 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth. Specifically, the Examiner states that "said insulating layer" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 61 has been amended to read "said first insulating layer" and, thus, provide proper antecedent basis. In view of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

#### Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,150,276 to Gonzalez et al.

Claims 61 through 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gonzalez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,150,276). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent Claims 61, 66, and 71 each require "removing at least a portion of said second insulating layer through use of chemical mechanical planarization until an upper portion of said first conductive layer is exposed." Thus, chemical mechanical planarization of a second insulating layer ceases once an upper layer of the first conductive layer is reached or exposed.

The Examiner relies on Gonzales et al. for disclosure of a method for forming a capacitor including the steps of forming a first insulating layer 40 having an opening 55 on a substrate (Fig. 3 and related text), forming a first conductive layer 60 over the first insulating layer 40 and within opening 55, and forming a second insulating layer 65 over the first conductive layer 60 (Fig. 4 and related text), all of which are also requirements of Claims 61, 66, and 71. Gonzales et al., however, does not disclose removing a portion of second insulating layer 65 through use of chemical mechanical planarization until an upper portion of the first conductive layer 60 is exposed. The Examiner relies on Fig. 7B of Gonzales et al. (and related text) as supporting the disclosure of this last element of the claims. (Office Action at page 4). Fig. 7B, however, shows the removal of the entire first conductive layer 60 so as to totally eliminate the same, as opposed

to the removal of second insulating layer 65 (shown in Fig. 4) down to an upper layer of first conductive layer 60, as required by the claims of the present application.

Alternatively, Gonzales et al. does disclose selective etching of various layers overlying conductive layer 60 (including second insulating layer 65), as illustrated in Fig. 7A. While this particular method does preserve an upper layer of conductive layer 60, the embodiment of Fig. 7A does not contemplate chemical mechanical planarization (or any other form of planarization) since this particular method of fabrication involves selective etching down to an upper layer of conductive layer 60. Significantly, this results in other layers (e.g., second insulating layer 65) remaining in multi-layered or non-planarized forms. Thus, chemical mechanical planarization, as required by the claims of the present application, is not disclosed.

In sum, Gonzales et al. does not disclose a process for fabricating a capacitor on a substrate, which process comprises removing at least a portion of a second insulating layer through use of chemical mechanical planarization until an upper portion of the first conductive layer is exposed. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102(e) rejection of Claims 61, claims 62-65 that depend therefrom, claim 66, claims 67-70 that depend therefrom, and claim 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,364,809 to Kwon et al. in View of U.S. Patent No. 5,150,276 to Gonzalez et al.

Claims 61 through 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,364,809) in view of Gonzalez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,150,276). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must

be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejections of claims 61-71 are improper because the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner contends that Kwon et al. discloses the claimed process for forming a capacitor including the step of forming a conformal first conductive layer 48 over the first insulating layer 46 and in the container 54, forming a second insulating layer 50 above the first conductive layer 48, and removing at least a portion of the second insulating layer 50 until an upper portion of the first conductive layer 48 is exposed.

Independent Claims 61, 66, and 71 each require forming a second insulating layer above a first conductive layer. This step expressly requires that a second insulating layer be formed over the entire first conductive layer, and not a portion of said layer. Additionally, as previously discussed, independent Claims 61, 66 and 71 each require "removing at least a portion of said second insulating layer through use of chemical mechanical planarization until an upper portion of said first conductive layer is exposed." Thus, according to the plain language of the claims, the chemical mechanical planarization of a second insulating layer ceases once an upper layer of the first conductive layer is reached or exposed.

The portions of Kwon et al. cited by the Examiner (Figs. 2-4 and related text on cols. 2-3) describe a method of fabricating a capacitor wherein a first polysilicon layer 48 is formed over a substrate 26. Thereafter, a second photoresist 50 is formed over the first polysilicon layer 48 to partially cover the polysilicon layer 48. Thus, portions of polysilicon layer 48 are left uncovered and exposed. Portions of second photoresist 50 are then removed to form openings 56 (Fig. 4D) within electrode regions 54 (shown in Fig. 4B).

Kwon et al. neither teaches nor suggests forming a second insulating layer above an entire first conductive layer, as required by the claims of the present invention. Likewise, the step of

removing at least a portion of said second insulating layer through use of chemical mechanical planarization is not taught or suggested in Kwon et al. In fact, Kwon et al. teaches away from planarization, instead teaching a method of etching back portions of the second photoresist 50 to form openings 56 within a portion of photoresist 50. Notably absent from Kwon et al. is any suggestion to planarize a second insulating layer (i.e., photoresist 50) through use of a chemical mechanical planarization until an upper portion of a first conductive layer (i.e., first polysilicon layer 48) is exposed. According to the disclosure in Kwon et al., such a step is, in fact, impossible to carry out since the first conductive layer is never fully covered. Thus, removal of a second insulating layer until an upper portion of said first conductive layer is exposed is unnecessary because the upper portion of the first conductive layer is already exposed and any subsequent use of chemical mechanical planarization would, by necessity, remove upper portions of the first conductive layer prior to removing any portion of the second insulating layer.

#### ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 61 and 66 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

#### CONCLUSION

Claims 61-71 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might

be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Edgar R. Cataxinos  
Registration No. 39,931  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 21, 2004  
ERC/ps:dn  
Document in ProLaw